

VZCZCXYZ0000
RR RUEHWEB

DE RUEHLO #2884/01 3571339
ZNY EEEEE ZZH
R 231339Z DEC 09
FM AMEMBASSY LONDON
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC 4507
INFO RUEHBJ/AMEMBASSY BEIJING 1275
RUEHMO/AMEMBASSY MOSCOW 3040
RUEHFR/AMEMBASSY PARIS 3553
RUEHVEN/USMISSION USOSCE 0637
RUCNDT/USMISSION USUN NEW YORK 1526
RUEHNO/USMISSION USNATO 1306
RUEHUNV/USMISSION UNVIE VIENNA 0408
RUEHBS/USEU BRUSSELS

UNCLAS E F T O LONDON 002884

SENSITIVE
SIPDIS

E.O. 12958: N/A
TAGS: [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [PTER](#) [AORC](#) [UNSC](#) [KPAO](#) [RS](#) [CH](#) [FR](#) [UK](#)
SUBJECT: P3 DISCUSS UNSCR 1540 WAY AHEAD

REF: A. STATE 122725
[1](#)B. STATE 127434

[1](#)1. (SBU) Summary: On December 15, representatives of the P3 (France, the UK, and the U.S.) who handle UNSCR 1540 implementation met in London for an agreed update on the Comprehensive Review outcome, the USG proposal for a 1540 Voluntary Fund, and to identify objectives for the 2010 Program of Work (POW). Each side agreed to review and pass along understandings to delegations in New York so that when the Committee renewed its work in 2010, there was a clear agreement - at least among the P3 - on priorities. France expressed clear political (but not yet financial) support for the proposed 1540 Voluntary Fund, while the UK has not yet determined its willingness either to commit funds or to support a dedicated funding mechanism to better resource the Committee activities in New York. There was, however, broad agreement that the ideas identified in the USG proposal were in line with the way ahead for 2010 to better align Committee activities with individual country needs. The EU was seen as a better source of sustained funding than either France or the UK. 1540 Coordinator Wuchte and Poloff emphasized USG redlines for the Comprehensive Review outcome document and suggested that in 2010 the P3 format be expanded to the P5, as both Russia (in particular) and China have areas where they can practically support overall implementation efforts. End Summary.

[1](#)2. (U) Background: United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1540 was adopted in April 2004 and has served as an important new international standard for all states regarding the establishment of controls on chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons; related materials; and their means of delivery. The P3 have met periodically to organize much of the initial effort of the Security Council's 1540 Committee to focus on organizational objectives, e.g., agreeing on rules of procedure, selecting its eight independent experts, and agreeing on how it should carry out its mandate. Since then, the P3 have spent much of their focus on encouraging states to submit country reports detailing the steps they have taken or intend to take to implement the myriad provisions of UNSCR 1540.

[1](#)3. (U) UNSCR 1810 extended the 1540 Committee's mandate to 2011, through P3 cooperation. To date, the United States, European Union, and Norway are the primary states that have offered to donate funds to resource 1540 Committee activities, whereas the P3 have provided the initiatives to organize the Committee. Aside from dedicated resources, the Committee is now well-positioned to fulfill its mandate more quickly in 2010. The P3 meeting focused on the Comprehensive Review outcomes as a way to address the fact that although

many states have requested assistance to enable them to implement (and report on) Resolution 1540, and many other states and international organizations have come forward to offer such assistance, the overall response has been slow in meeting the capacity-building needs identified through contributions and outreach. The main points addressed below were agreed to ensure the Committee, with a new chairman in 2010, can quickly address the next steps. End Background.

14. (SBU) The P3 meeting:

-- Stressed that the agreed to Program of Work (POW) should be a technical rollover, stated support for the work group, and stressed work groups do not need a chair to meet - in fact, this is an advantage to the work groups. The UK said that it was happy to once again lead the work groups.

-- Underscored the need to support a voluntary funding mechanism, noting that not everyone could make a financial contribution but that the Committee needed a robust mechanism that served a multi-donor process.

-- Suggested members of the P3 send their common positions to New York in the same way that kept unity on renewal in 2008, as this Comprehensive Review outcome and work program will likely be the basis for the next renewal discussion.

-- On experts, asked France to consider reintroducing a non-paper that provides direct guidance on the responsibilities of the experts group, with tasks for the eight experts. France indicated that experts could be encouraged to take more initiative if the Committee gave more guidance to them and explicitly welcomed such initiative.

-- Supported keeping interested countries in the loop with more participation by capitals and non-UNSC members. The U.S. indicated that it would recirculate to the P3 the Norwegian proposal to establish an informal group of friends as an idea worth pursuing.

-- Underscored that the experts should not be tackling "broad policy" questions but should focus on areas of their expertise, and noted that it was delegation representatives who needed to resolve broad policy issues. To best address policy issues, the U.S. suggested that France consider hosting a next meeting that included Russia at a minimum and possibly China. The U.S. noted that it was encouraging greater China involvement at a bilateral dialogue this same week in Beijing.

-- Noted that clear instructions were sent to resolve the problems regarding responding to assistance requests and posting of matrices.

-- Agreed to work closely with France who have the lead on assistance, with the UK taking the POW.

-- Stressed a P3 division of labor for intergovernmental organizations: France to seek guidance and raise the issue with BWC Implementation Support Unit; the UK to approach OPCW; and the United States to work with Vienna-based IAEA. In 2010 we would seek formal agreements among all three groups.

15. (SBU) Privately with the UK, the U.S. stressed concerns about the proposed establishment of a regional position in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) dedicated to 1540 implementation. The OSCE continues actively to address the issue of enhancing 1540 implementation, and we are working with the current Forum for Security Cooperation (FSC) Chair (UK) to fund a 1540 technical assistance/coordinator position in the OSCE Secretariat - to which State's Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs has allocated \$100k. The project was all but finalized in late October, but the job announcement has not moved through the UK to the OSCE Secretariat in the Conflict Prevention Center (CPC). UK interlocutor Phil Richards acknowledged little movement and noted that there were position changes in his delegation and budget office.

He noted that the follow-on funding could be in jeopardy if not introduced this fiscal year. 1540 Coordinator Wuchte reiterated our view that the project was superbly put together by the UK and that we should not lose this opportunity. He asked for the UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) to ensure that a clear path was understood before the OSCE started its winter break.

16. (U) This cable was cleared with 1540 Coordinator Tom Wuchte. Post appreciates Washington support.
Visit London's Classified Website:
[http://www.intelink.sgov.gov/wiki/Portal:Unit edKingdom](http://www.intelink.sgov.gov/wiki/Portal:Unit%20edKingdom)

Susman